

United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/155,076	10/23/1998	SUSAN ADELE GREENFIELD	263/PPIR2548	8070
7590 11/30/2004		EXAMINER		
WENDEROTH LIND & PONACK			TURNER, SHARON L	
2033 K STREET N W SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/155,076	GREENFIELD ET AL.	
navioury notion	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Sharon L. Turner	1647	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	n appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 17 September 2004 FAILS TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is require final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eit condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	ed to avoid abandonment of this her: (1) a timely filed amendmo Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3	s application. A proper reply to a ent which places the application in	
PERIOD FO	OR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPL 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sh (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for a later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS. The date on which the petition under 37 of extension and the corresponding amountened statutory period for reply original.	g date of the final rejection. OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee Int of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under	I
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>11-15-04</u> . A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (3)			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be enter	ered because:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require	e further consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see	Note below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the applic issues for appeal; and/or	ation in better form for appeal i	by materially reducing or simplifying th	е
(d) they present additional claims without on NOTE:	canceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	g rejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	would be allowable if submitted	I in a separate, timely filed amendment	
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ requapplication in condition for allowance becau	est for reconsideration has bee se: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	n considered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be consider raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		DLELY to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amene explanation of how the new or amended cla			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as fo	llows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>13, 16, 30, 31, 33. All rejected</u>	tions are maintained for the same	reasons of record. No new rejections are	
applied.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8 The drawing correction filed on is a)		and by the Everniner	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	•	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure States 10. Other:		. 	
10. Utilei	MAGALIS	I TURNER, PH.D.	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Both replies of 9-14-04 and 9-17-04 will be entered. All rejections are maintained for the same reasons of record. No new rejections are applied. Applicants arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Rejection over the Soreq patent was previously withdrawn in view of claim amendments, i.e., the negative limitation directed to "and having no cholinesterase activity". This negative limitation is no longer present in the claims and required reinstatement of the rejection. The Westwall declaration has been fully considered but was not considered persuasive because the Soreq peptides exhibit calcium channel modulatory function in association with their activity as anti-cholinesterase molecules. The declaration does not evidence in Figure 1 that the T40 peptides do not modulate calcium channel modulatory function, but only that the % control ACh response is not potentiated. No evidence of record correlates the data of % Ach response to a failure of T40 to mediate calcium channel modulatory function. Accordingly the data does not evidence that the T40 and other Soreq peptides are not effective in calcium channel modulatory function that is recognized as correlating with anti-cholinesterase activity. Therefore the declaration is non-persuasive to remove the prior art reference and rejection of record.

SHARON L. TURNER, PH.D.
PATENT EXAMINER